

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
ABERDEEN DIVISION**

**THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE  
COMPANY OF AMERICA**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**NO. 1:21-CV-123-DMB-RP**

**JEFFREY JOHNSON, CHRISTOPHER  
JOHNSON, MITCHELL JOHNSON, and  
MARTHA ANN JOHNSON**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

On September 13, 2022, Jeffrey Johnson, Christopher Johnson, and Mitchell Johnson filed an “Unopposed Motion Requesting Entry of a Consent Judgment.” Doc. #57. Representing that “the parties reached an agreement which with this Court’s permission would resolve this pending matter completely” and that their motion is unopposed, these defendants request entry of “a consent judgment directing the Clerk to distribute all funds in the Court’s registry” in the manner agreed upon by the parties and reflected in their proposed consent judgment. *Id.* at PageID 390–91. The proposed consent judgment is signed on behalf of all remaining parties.<sup>1</sup>

Generally, before entering a consent judgment, also called a consent decree, courts must decide whether it represents a reasonable factual and legal determination based on the facts of record, whether established by evidence, affidavit, or stipulation. Courts must also ascertain that the settlement is fair and that it does not violate the Constitution, statutes, or jurisprudence. In assessing the propriety of giving judicial imprimatur to the consent decree, the court must also consider the nature of the litigation and the purposes to be served by the decree.

*Jones v. Gusman*, 296 F.R.D. 416, 428–29 (E.D. La. 2013) (cleaned up).

The Court has reviewed the proposed consent judgment and believes that it represents a fair and reasonable factual and legal determination based on the facts of record and is consistent

---

<sup>1</sup> The Prudential Insurance Company of America was dismissed with prejudice March 11, 2022, on the parties’ joint motion. Doc. #31.

with the nature of this litigation. The Court also finds that the proposed consent judgment does not violate the Constitution, statutes, or jurisprudence. Accordingly, the motion [57] is **GRANTED**. A final judgment consistent with the parties' proposed consent judgment will be signed and entered by the Court. Martha Johnson's pending motion for summary judgment [48] is **DENIED as moot**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 20th day of September, 2022.

/s/Debra M. Brown  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**